

Revue d'Etudes Tibétaines



numéro vingt-neuf— Avril 2014

Revue d'Etudes Tibétaines

numéro vingt-neuf — Avril 2014

ISSN 1768-2959

Directeur : Jean-Luc Achard.

Comité de rédaction : Anne Chayet, Alice Travers, Jean-Luc Achard.

Comité de lecture : Ester Bianchi (Università degli Studi di Perugia), Anne Chayet (CNRS), Fabienne Jagou (EFEO), Rob Mayer (Oriental Institute, University of Oxford), Fernand Meyer (CNRS-EPHE), Ramon Prats (Universitat Pompeu Fabra, Barcelona), Charles Ramble (EPHE, CNRS), Françoise Robin (INALCO), Brigitte Steinman (Université de Lille), Alice Travers (CNRS), Jean-Luc Achard (CNRS).

Périodicité

La périodicité de la *Revue d'Etudes Tibétaines* est généralement bi-annuelle, les mois de parution étant, sauf indication contraire, Octobre et Avril. Les contributions doivent parvenir au moins six (6) mois à l'avance. Les dates de proposition d'articles au comité de lecture sont Novembre pour une parution en Avril, et Mai pour une parution en Octobre.

Participation

La participation est ouverte aux membres statutaires des équipes CNRS, à leurs membres associés, aux doctorants et aux chercheurs non-affiliés. Les articles et autres contributions sont proposées aux membres du comité de lecture et sont soumis à l'approbation des membres du comité de rédaction. Les articles et autres contributions doivent être inédits ou leur ré-édition doit être justifiée et soumise à l'approbation des membres du comité de lecture. Les documents doivent parvenir sous la forme de fichiers Word, envoyés à l'adresse du directeur (jeanluc.achard@sfr.fr).

Comptes-rendus

Les livres proposés pour compte-rendu doivent être envoyés à la *Revue d'Etudes Tibétaines*, 22, avenue du Président Wilson, 75016 Paris.

Langues

Les langues acceptées dans la revue sont le français (en priorité), l'anglais, l'allemand, l'italien, l'espagnol, le tibétain et le chinois.

La *Revue d'Etudes Tibétaines* est publiée par l'UMR 8155 (CRCAO) du CNRS, Paris.



Revue d'Etudes Tibétaines

numéro vingt-neuf — Avril 2014

Dylan Esler

On the Life of gNubs-chen Sangs-rgyas ye-shes

pp. 5-27

Saul Mullard

Sikkim and the Sino-Nepalese War of 1788-1792: A Communiqué from Bão tài to the Sikkimese Commander Yug Phyogs thub

pp. 29-37

Sam van Schaik

A Tibetan Catalogue of the Works of 'Jigs-med gling-pa

pp. 39-63

རང་ཁྱོད་ཀྱི་སྒྲིག་པ་མ

ཁྱི་ཀ་རི་ཇོ་ཇོ་ལྷ་ཁང་གི་སྤྲུང་བ་དང་གནས་བབ་ལ་རགས་ཚམ་དཔྱད་པ།

pp. 65-89

Nathan W. Hill

Some Tibetan verb forms that violate Dempsey's law

pp. 91-101

Lobsang Nyima Laurent

The Upper Temple of Dangkhar Monastery — Iconographical Capharnaüm or Political Manoeuvre?

pp. 103-153

John Vincent Bellezza

Straddling the Millennial Divide — A case study of persistence and change in the Tibetan ritual tradition based on the *Gnag rabs* of Gathang Bumpa and Eternal Bon documents, circa 900–1100 CE

pp. 155-243

Daisuke Murakami

Aspects of the Traditional Gambling known as *Sho* in Modern Lhasa, Tibet — religious and gendered worldviews infusing the Tibetan dice game


pp. 245-270



Some Tibetan verb forms that violate Dempsey's law

Nathan W. Hill

(SOAS)

 Jakob Dempsey suggests that Tibetan *-i-* before velars often derives from an original *-e-* (Dempsey 2001: 217, 2003: 90, Hill 2012: 73, Hill 2013: 202-203).¹ Chinese cognates with the vowel *-e-* provide good motivation for this suggestion.²

Tib. གཅིག *gčig* < *g^hiek 'one' : Chi. 隻 *tsyek* < *tek (1260c) 'one of a pair'

Tib. མཇིང *mjin* < *m^hin (Bodman's law) < *m^hien 'neck' : Chi. 領 *ljengX* < *renʔ (0823f)

OTib. མཇིང *myin* < *m^hien 'name' : Chi. 名 *mjieng* < *C.men (0826a)

Tib. འདྲེན *ldzin* < *h^hdzen 'quarrel, fight v.', Ch. 爭 *tsreang* < *m-ts^hren (0811a) 'strife, quarrel'

Tib. རྩེན *rdzin* < *rdzen 'pond' : Chi. 井 *tsjengX* < *C.tsenʔ (0819a) 'well (n.)'

Tib. སྲིང་མོ *sriin-mo* < *sren-mo 'sister of a man' : Chi. 甥 *sraeng* < *s.ren (0812g) 'sister's child'

The cases where Chinese has *-i-* before a velar show that this sound change is indeed a merger.

Tib. རྩེན་མོ *tshigs* 'joint' : Chi. 節 *tset* < *ts^hik (0399e) 'joint of

¹ This essay uses the Library of Congress system for transliterating Tibetan with the following changes: 'h' rather than apostrophe, 'č' rather than of 'c', and 'j' rather than 'j'. For Chinese I provide the character followed by Baxter's Middle Chinese (1992), an Old Chinese reconstruction taken from or compatible with the current version of Baxter and Sagart's system (2011), and the character number in Karlgren (1964[1957]). Like in Baxter's own recent work, for Middle Chinese I use 'ae' and 'ea' in place of his original 'æ' and 'ē'. I do not however following him is changing 'i' to '+'.
² The same change occurs in the pre-history of Latin (e.g. Lat. *septingentī* 'seven hundred' < *septem+centum, Lat. *tingō* 'moisten', versus Gk. τέγγω; Lat. *quīnque* 'five', Gk. πέντε, Skt. *pāñcan* cf. Leumann 1977: 45).

bamboo'

Tib. སྒྲིག *śig* 'louse' : Chi. 虱 *srit* < *sri[k] (0506a) 'louse'

Tib. འཇུག *hkhyig* 'tie, fasten, suffocate' : Chi. 縊 *'ejH* < *q'ik-s (0849g) 'strangle'

Tib. ན་ཁིང *na-niñ* 'last year' : Chi. 年 *nen* < *C.n⁵iŋ (0364a) 'harvest; year'

Tib. སྒྲིང *śiñ* 'tree' : Chi. 薪 *sin* < *si[ŋ] (0382n) 'firewood'

Tib. སྙིང *sñiñ* 'heart' : Chi. 仁 *nyin* < *niŋ (0388f) 'kindness'

Internal to Tibetan, Dempsey's law helps to explain the failure of some laterals to undergo Benedict's law (*l- > ž-). If Benedict's law preceded Dempsey's law, one can explain why all instances of *li-* appear in words with velar finals. The words ཞིང *žiñ* 'field' and འཇུག *liñs* 'hunt' were originally *liŋ (with *liŋ a subphonemic pronunciation) 'field' and *leŋs 'hunt'; after the application of Benedict's law they became *žiñ 'field' and *leŋs 'hunt'; after the application of Dempsey's law they became the attested ཞིང *žiñ* 'field' and འཇུག *liñs* 'hunt'. Dempsey's law also accounts for the lack of palatalization in most words that contain the sequences *-di-* and *-ni-* (cf. Hill 2013: 202-203).

If all instances of inherited *-e-* before velars changed to *-i-*, then one expects to find no native Tibetan words that contain the sequences *-eñ* or *-eg*. Nonetheless, there are many such words, both nouns (འབྲེང *hbren* 'braid', རྩེང *phren* 'rosary', རྩེག *dreg* 'dirt, རྩེགས *dregs* 'pride', དེང *den* 'these days') and verbs (སྒྲེག *sreg* 'burn', གཤེགས *gśegs* 'go', འདྲེང *hden* 'go', སྒྲེག *sñeg* 'chase', སེང *señ* 'purify, clean'). Loanwords and analogical developments are the most common phenomena which lead to the apparent violation of exceptionless soundlaws (Campbell 2004: 16-120, esp. 109-111); few of the Tibetan words with rimes *-eñ* and *-eg* are obvious loanwords, consequently, it is likely that some of the exceptions are analogical developments.

Paradigms provide one source of inspiration for the creation of analogical forms. Tibetan nouns are invariant across the noun paradigm; examples of paradigmatic analogical changes in the nominal system will be difficult to find. However, Tibetan verbs have intricate inflectional paradigms that provide ample models for analogical innovations (Coblin 1976, Hill 2010: xv-xxii). The remainder of this essay explores analogical explanations for the forms སེང *señ* 'purify, clean', སྒྲེག *sñeg* 'chase', གཤེགས *gśegs* 'go, come', and རྩེག *ldeg* 'teeter'.

The verb སེང *señ* 'purify, clean' is explainable as an alternative present to the verb (present) བསྐྱོད *sañs* / བསྐྱོད *bsañ*, (past) བསྐྱོད *bsañs*, (future) བསྐྱོད *bsañ*, (imperative) སྐྱོད *soñs* 'cleanse, purify'. Stems of this

verb are well known from Tibet's religious vocabulary, with *sañs* appearing in the compound *sañs-rgyas* 'buddha' and the stem *bsañs* used as a noun 'juniper fumigation ritual' in its own right. Analogy well motivates the form *señ* that violates Dempsey's law. A verb such as *byed*, *byas*, *bya*, *byos* 'do' serves as a convenient model: *byas* : *byed* :: *bsañs* : X, in which X was solved for with *señ*. The other two available present stems *sañs* and *bsañ* are also explainable as analogical developments. The stem *sañs* is arrived at through the removal of the *b-* past prefix. The past suffix *-s* was not removed because final *-s* may appear in present stems; compare *hčhags*, *bśags*, *bśag*, *śogs* 'confess'. The opposite strategy results in the present stem *bsañ*; in this case not the past suffix *-s*, but the prefix *b-* remains, this time on the model of a verb such as *bgro*, *bgros*, *bgro*, *gros* 'argue, discuss'. The existence of three alternative presents *señ*, *sañs*, and *bsañ*, and the ease with which analogy accounts for them both suggest that an inherited present was ousted from this paradigm. In this case the etymological present *gsiñ* < **gsen* 'strain, purify' occurs as an independent verb; the inherited paradigm was *gsiñ*, *bsañs*, *bsañ*, *soñs*.

The form *sñeg* 'chase' is also explainable as an analogical development. Although Hill gives separate verbs *√sñeg* (*sñeg*, *bsñegs*, *bsñeg*, *sñogs*) 'chase after' and *√sñag* (*sñog*, *bsñags*, *bsñag*, *sñogs*, 2010: 108-112), a single passage from the Old Tibetan version of the *Rāmāyaṇa* attests all four forms of this verb, yielding the paradigm *sñegs*, *bsñags*, *bsñag*, *sñogs*.

- (1) *rñ-po-čhe-ñi ri-dags śig byuñ-ba / lha-mos « jo-bo sñogs » śes
gsol-pa-dañ / rgyal-po źal-nas / « ħu nñ bzlu-ba-ñi ri-dags yin-
bas / bsñag-du myi ruñ-ste / ħdñ sñegs-pa-ñi pyi-na / khyod
ħphrog-pa ħoñ » źes bgyis-na / lha-mo mchid-nas « ri-dags kyīs
bslur ħñ mchis // ... rgyal-po źal-nas // « ñas ri-dags bsñag-gīs
// Lag-śa-na gar yañ ma-ħgro-bar // lha-mo sruñ-śig » čhes
gsuñ-ste / ri-dags bsñagso //*

When a precious deer arose, the lady requested 'lord **chase** [imperative] (it)!' The king said, 'this is a deceitful deer, it is not appropriate to **chase** [future] (it).' If I were to **chase** [present] it, thou wouldest be absconded.' The lady said, 'how can a deer be deceitful...' The king said, 'I will **chase** [future] the deer, but Lakṣaṇa, going nowhere, guard the lady!' He **chased** [past] the deer. (I.O.L. Tib J 0737.1, ll. 144-150, cf. de Jong 1989: 113)

Even if later texts do distinguish the verbs $\sqrt{s\dot{n}eg}$ (སྟེག *sñeg*, བསྟེགས *bsñegs*, བསྟེག *bsñeg*, སྟོགས *sñogs*) and $\sqrt{s\dot{n}ag}$ (སྟོག *sñog*, བསྟོགས *bsñags*, བསྟོག *bsñag*, སྟོགས *sñogs*), this passage makes clear that forms with the vowel 'e' started life in the present stem སྟེགས *sñegs*. The reanalysis of the final -s as a past suffix allows for the creation of a new present སྟེག *sñeg*, with the past བསྟེགས *bsñegs* and future བསྟེག *bsñeg*, deriving from this stem through the normal application of the affixes *b-* and *-s*. If the verbal root were in fact $\sqrt{s\dot{n}eg}$, the imperative would not undergo 'o' ablaut. However, the salience of 'o' for marking the imperative led to the suppletive borrowing of the original imperative instead of an ablautless form such as **sñegs*. These considerations demonstrate that the entire paradigm of $\sqrt{s\dot{n}eg}$ is born from the present stem སྟེགས *sñegs*, but this stem itself is a violation of Dempsey's law and requires explanation. The inherited present **sñigs* (< **sñegs*) was analogically restored to སྟེགས *sñegs* just as གསེང *gsin* < **gsen* was replaced with སེང *sen*, but whereas གསེང *gsin* enjoyed a new life as a verb with specialized semantics, the attested verb $\sqrt{s\dot{n}ig}$ 'discard' (སྟོག *sñig*, བསྟོགས *bsñigs*, བསྟོག *bsñig*, སྟོགས *sñigs*, cf. Hill 2010: 109) blocked this possibility for **sñigs*.

Although གཤེགས *gśegs* 'go, come' is an invariant verb already in Old Tibetan, there is evidence that it originates as a present stem. Jäschke points out that the form སོག *śog*, synchronically the imperative of ལོན *lon* 'come', is "properly" the imperative of གཤེགས *gśegs* (1881: 503). With the paradigm of a verb like $\sqrt{lañ}$ 'take' (ལེན *lend*, ལླངས *blañs*, ལླང *blañ*, ལོང *lon*) 'take' in mind, one might speculate that གཤེགས *gśegs* originally had the following paradigm.

pres. གཤེགས *gśegs*
 past. **bśags*
 fut. **bśag*
 imp. སོག *śog*

Róna-Tas reconstructs an unattested form of this verb **gśags* on the basis of Balti dialect *śags* 'go' and the Monguor loan from Tibetan *śiaqla* 'pass away' (1966: 95 #670). In a review R. A. Miller highlights that "the Monguor form and the Balti reflex are particularly important since they give evidence for an original **a-grade*" (1968: 156). Sprigg confirms the Balti word *śags* with the meaning 'come, go, sit' (2002: 151).

Written Tibetan	Balti	English
རེག <i>reg</i>	<i>rjaxs</i>	'begin'
འཐོང <i>hthen</i>	<i>thjan</i>	'limp'
ལྷེག <i>ldeg</i>	<i>ldjaqlджа</i>	'swinging up and down'
ཐེག <i>theg</i>	<i>thjaq</i>	'be able to list'

Table 1: The correspondence of Written Tibetan *-e-* to Balti *-ja-* (after Zemp 2006 qtd. in Jacques 2009)

The Monguor form supports the reconstruction of a nuclear vowel **a*, but it is not entirely clear that Balti also supports this reconstruction. Jacques demonstrates that western Tibetic languages undergo a change of *e > ja* before velars (2009). In general the presence of medial *-j-* signals whether the Balti reflex derives from Tibetan *-e-* or *-a-*, thus Balti *thjaq* < Tib. ཐེག *theg* 'be able to list' versus Balti *thaqpa* < Tib. ཐག་པ་ *thag-pa* 'rope' (cf. Sprigg 2002: 163, 239). However, since *ś-* is already a palatal consonant this distinction does not manifest after this consonant; the vowel of Balti *śags* reconstructs to either **-e-* or **-a-* with equal ease.

Róna-Tas' reconstruction of a prefix **g-* in the ancestor of Balti *śags* appears unmotivated. Eunice Jones, a linguist who has lived in Baltistan for many years, informs me that although some Balti dialects, such as that of Khapalu, retain many of the etymological cluster initials in verb stems, she is unaware of any dialect that has a cluster initial in the word *śaxpha* 'go' (imp. *śoxs*) (letter, 4 February 2013). Balti thus supports the reconstruction of a past stem **śags* (or possibly **śegs*) and an imperative **śogs*.³ More significant than the Balti form is the pronunciation of གཤེགས *gśegs* 'die' in Lhasa dialect as /`shaa/, which Kitamura renders orthographically as གཤགས *gśags* (1975: 60).

Even without evidence for pronunciation of the past with an 'a' vocalism, the absence of the *g-* prefix from the attested Tibetan imperative ཤོག *śog* guarantees that the *g-* and the *-e-* of the form གཤེགས *gśegs* are derivational and not elements of the root. Furthermore, the 'e' vowel and the final *-s*, which takes the form *-d* after open syllables and grave consonants, seen in གཤེགས *gśegs* are characteristic of a present stem (cf. Coblin 1976: 51-54).

The invariant verb གཤེགས *gśegs* is a generalized present stem, but this stem itself is a violation of Dempsey's law and requires

³ Bielmeier's grammar of Balti does not include this words (1985: 245).

explanation. The anticipated inherited form is *gśigs (< *gśegs), which is as far as known to me unattested in any meaning.

The only way to tie the two attested forms, གཤེགས *gśegs* and འོག ནོག *śog* is to suggest that there was once a verb with the paradigm *gśegs, *bśags, *bśag, འོག ནོག *śog*, or, following the evidence of Balti for an unprefix past, *gśegs, *śags, *śag, འོག ནོག *śog*. Dempsey's law then led *gśegs to become *gśigs. Next, analogy replaced the present *gśigs with གཤེགས *gśegs*, when *(b)śags and *(b)śag were still current. Finally, paradigmatic leveling led all stems except གཤེགས *gśegs* to fall into disuse; འོག ནོག remained as a suppletive member of another verb (viz. རོང ལོང 'come').

The doublet of verbs ལྷེག *ldeg* 'shake' and ལྷེག ལྷེག *ldig* 'shake' looks like another case in which Dempsey's law changed *-eg to -ig, only to be counteracted by analogical restoration. The *Mdzañs blun* provides a clear example of ལྷེག *ldeg* meaning 'teeter'.

- (2) *lhalhi pho-bran kun ldeg-čin g.yos-nas lha rnamś dñanś-te
bltas-na/ byañ-chub-sems-dpas lus-kyi pags-pa sbyin-par byas
mthoñ-nas/*

All the palaces of the gods teetered and shook, when the gods, afeared, looked, they saw that the Mahāsattva had offered the skin of his own body. (*Mdzañs blun*, Derge Kanjur, vol. 74 folio 172b)

The inherited present ལྷེག *ldig* occurs in the phrase མི་ལྷེག་པའི་ཆོས་ *mi ldig pañi chos* 'unwavering dharma' (cf. Derge Kanjur, vol. 40, p. 42a, vol. 45, p. 41a).

The presents ལྷེག *ldig* (inherited) and ལྷེག ལྷེག *ldeg* (renewed) should derive from a root √lag, with a paradigm that includes past *blags, future *blag, and imperative *logs. The verb ལྷགས *blags* 'incline', seen in the phrase རྩ་བ་ལྷགས་ *rna-ba blags* 'incline one's ear' (cf. de Jong 1973), is semantically close enough to 'teeter', to warrant its interpretation as the past stem of ལྷེག *ldig* / ལྷེག ལྷེག *ldeg*. De Jong does not provide a textual citation for རྩ་བ་ལྷགས་ *rna-ba blags* 'incline one's ear', instead relying on the *Mahāvvyutpatti* and other lexical sources. Nonetheless, the Kanjur offers a number of attestations of རྩ་བ་ལྷགས་ *rna-ba blags* 'incline one's ear'.

- (3) *mdor-na dud-ḥgro-ñi skye-gnas-su gtogs-pañi semś-can dag
kyañ sgra sñan-pa de-la rna blags-te sñan-to// de-nas bñom-
ldan-ḥdas-kyis dge-sloñ rnamś-la bkañ-stsal-pa/*

In sum, even the beings who belong to the real of animals inclined their ears to that mellifluous sound and listened. Then the Bhagavan addressed his disciplines. (*Vinaya-kṣudraka-vastu*, Derge Kanjur, vol. 10, 42b)

- (4) *des tshe-dañ-ldan-pa sñan-pa Bzañ-ldan-gyi skad-kyi gtañ-rag thos-nas kyañ yañ rna-ba blags-te mi g.yo-bar sdod-do/*

Having heard the words of the speech of the venerable and renowned Bhadrika, he inclined his ears and sat immobile. (*Vinaya-kṣudraka-vastu*, Derge Kanjur, vol. 10, 42b)

- (5) *de Rgyal-byed-kyi tshal logs-su soñ-nas khad-kyis khad-kyis Rgyal-byed-kyi tshal-du phyin-pa-dañ/ Rgyal-byed-kyi tshal-kyi sgo-nas rna-blags-te sdod-do/*

He went in the direction of the Jetavana grove, slowly arrived at the Jetavana grove, and sat inclining his ear, at the gate of the Jetavana grove (*Vinaya-kṣudraka-vastu*, Derge Kanjur, vol. 10, 43a)

Recognizing that རྒྱུག *ldeg* 'teeter' and བླགས *blags* 'incline' are two stems of the same verb permits one to notice the (lack of) parallelism between the phrases རྒྱུག་ཅིང་གཡོས་ *ldeg-č'in g.yos* 'teeter and shake' in example 2 and བླགས་དེ་མི་གཡོ་ *blags-te mi g.yo* 'incline and not move' in example 4.

Not all examples of བླགས *blags* in the Kanjur are proceeded by རྩ་བ་ *rna-ba* 'ear'. The *Vinaya-vibhaṅga* offers two identical examples of རྒྱུང་གིས་བླགས་པ་ *rluñ-gis blags-pa* 'shaken by the wind'.

- (6) *dper-na śiñ-ljon dag-gi lo-ma sna-tshogs rluñ-gis blags-pa dag gcig-tu lhuñ-žin gcig-tu ḥdug-pa de bžin-du khyed-cag kyañ rigs sna-tshogs-dañ/ rus sna-tshogs-dañ/ khyim sna-tshogs-nas rab-tu byuñ-ba dag yin-gyi/ kho-boḥi ḥphags-pas ni byañ-chub thugs-su chud-pa yin-no/*

For example, like the various leaves of trees, shaken by the wind, fall and sit together, although you are monks, from various lineages, clans, and houses, because of my nobility you (all together) enter the enlightened mind

(*Vinaya-vibhaṅga*, Derge Kanjur, vol. 6, 24a-b, vo. 7, 4a-b)

Another use of བླགས *blags* is in the phrase མཆི་མ་བླགས *mchi-ma blags*, which Btsan lha ṅag dbaṅ tshul khrims equates with མཆི་མ་ཤོར *mchi-ma śor* 'cry' (1997: 185). I wonder whether, the literal meaning 'for tears to teeter' might instead more precisely mean 'to hold back tears'. Example 7 is one of many attestations of མཆི་མ་ཤོར *mchi-ma-śor* in the Kanjur that could be cited.

(7) *gcan-gzan-gyis khod ciḥi phyir ḥdi ltar mi dgaḥ źes dris-na/*
mchi-ma blags-nas rgyas-par smras-pa daṅ/

When the creature asked 'why art thou unhappy like this', after crying, he explained in detail. (*Mdzangs blun*, Derge Kanjur, vol. 74 folio 172a)

It is difficult to locate unambiguous future stems of the verb in question. In example 8, མི་བླག *mi blag* 'not incline' is either a future or a present. If it is a present, then it is built analogically to the past བླགས *blags*, replacing the inherited present ལྡིག *ldig*.

(8) *kha-cig rna mi blag gus-par mi ṅān-ciṅ bkaḥ-ṅān-paḥi sems*
ñe-bar mi ḥjog-la/ ḥhos-kyi rjes-su ḥthun-paḥi chos-la nan-tan
mi byed-na ...

If someone does not incline his ear, does not listen, does not establish a loyal and obedient mind, and does not act diligently for dharma that accords with dharma...
(*Aṣṭādaśasāhasrikā-prajñāpāramitā-nāma-mahāyāna-sūtra*, Derge Kanjur, vol. 31, page 76b)

The expected imperative *logs appears not to occur. One might explain that 'teeter' is not a voluntary verb, but at least in English one can use the imperative 'incline thine ear unto my sayings' (Proverbs 4:20). With the orthographic form ལོགས *logs* in mind, it is perhaps not too far fetched to suggest that the noun ལོགས *logs* 'the side' is derived from the same root as this verb.

This investigation of exceptions to Dempsey's law permits the conclusion that the verbs མེར *sen* 'purify, clean', སྡོག *sñeg* 'chase', གཤེགས *gśegs* 'go, come', and ལྡིག *ldig* 'teeter' are analogical present formations; the inherited presents of these verbs, with *-i-* vocalism, have been replaced with the *-e-* vocalisms more typical of the present stem. The

inherited paradigms, together with brief remarks on subsequent developments, can be summarized as follows:

√sañ 'cleanse, purify'.

pres. གསེང *gsin* (exists alongside the analogical སེང *sen*)

past བསངས *bsaṅs*

fut. བསང *bsaṅ*

imp. སོངས *soṅs*

√sñag 'chase, pursue'

pres. *sñigs (replaced by analogical སྟྱགས *sñegs*)

past བསྟྱགས *bsñags*

fut. བསྟྱག *bsñag*

imp. སྟྱགས *sñogs*

√śag 'go'

pres. *gśigs (replaced by analogical གཤེགས *gśegs*)

past *(b)śags (replaced through paradigmatic leveling by གཤེགས *gśegs*)

fut. *(b)śag (replaced through paradigmatic leveling by གཤེགས *gśegs*)

imp. ཤོག *śog* (continues as imperative of རོང *hon* 'come', replaced in this paradigm through paradigmatic leveling by གཤེགས *gśegs*)

√lag 'teeter, incline'

pres. ལྷེག *ldig* (exists alongside the analogical ལྷེག *ldeg*)

past ལྷགས *blags*

fut. ལྷག *blag* (?)

imp. *logs (but cf. ལོགས *logs* 'side')

References

- Baxter, William H. 1992. *A Handbook of Old Chinese Phonology*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Baxter, William H. and Laurent Sagart. 2011. Baxter-Sagart Old Chinese reconstruction (Version 1.00). Online at: <http://crlao.ehess.fr/document.php?id=1217>.
- Bielmeier, Roland (1985). *Das Märchen von Prinzen Čobzan*. Sankt Augustin: VGH Wissenschaftsverlag.

- Btsan lha ñag dbaṅ tshul khrim (1997). *Brda dkrol gser gyi me loṅ*. Beijing: Mi rigs dpe skrun khaṅ.
- Campbell, Lyle (2004). *Historical linguistics: an introduction*. 2nd ed. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Coblin, W. South (1976). "Notes on Tibetan verbal morphology." *T'oung Pao* 62: 45-60.
- Dempsey, Jakob (2001). "Remarks on the vowel system of old Burmese." *Linguistics of the Tibeto-Burman Area* 24.2: 205-34. Errata 26.1: 183.
- Dempsey, Jakob (2003). "Analysis of Rime-Groups in Northern-Burmish." *Linguistics of the Tibeto-Burman Area* 26.1: 63-124.
- Guillaume Jacques (2009). "Le développement du tibétain ancien -e- dans les dialectes occidentaux." *Études mongoles et sibériennes, centrasiatiques et tibétaines* 40.
<http://emscat.revues.org/index1500.html>
- Hill, Nathan W. (2010). *A Lexicon of Tibetan Verb Stems as Reported by the Grammatical Tradition*. Munich: Bayerische Akademie der Wissenschaften.
- Hill, Nathan W. (2012). "Evolution of the Burmese vowel system." *Transactions of the Philological Society* 110.1: 64-79.
- Hill, Nathan W. (2013). "Relative order of Tibetan sound changes affecting laterals." *Language and Linguistics* 14.1: 193-209.
- Jäschke, Heinrich August (1991). *A Tibetan-English dictionary*. London: Unger Brothers.
- de Jong, Jan Willem Jong (1973). "Tibetan 'blag-pa' and 'blags-pa'" *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies, University of London* 36.2: 309-312
- de Jong, Jan Willem (1989). *The story of Rāma in Tibet: text and translation of the Tun-huang manuscripts*. Wiesbaden: Franz Steiner.
- Karlgren, Bernhard. 1964. *Grammata Serica Recensa*. Stockholm: Museum of Far Eastern Antiquities.

Kitamura, Hajime (1975). "The Honorifics in Tibetan." *Acta Asiatica* 29: 56-74.

Leumann, Manu (1977). *Lateinische Laut- und Formenlehre*. Munich: Beck.

Miller, Roy Andrew (1968). (Review of Róna-Tas 1966). *Language* 44.1: 147–168.

Róna-Tas, András (1966). *Tibeto-Mongolica: the Tibetan loanwords of Monguor and the development of the archaic Tibetan dialects*. The Hague: Mouton.

Sprigg, R. K. (2002). *Balti-English English-Balti dictionary*. Richmond: RoutledgeCurzon.

Zemp, Marius (2006). Synchronic and diachronic phonology of the Tibetan dialect of Kargil. Universität Bern, MA thesis.

